

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 are pending in the present application. Claim 3 was previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 as being anticipated by Beardsley, Statutory Invention Registration No. H1869.

No amendments to the claims are made herein.

Applicant hereby responds to the Examiner's objections and rejections as described below.

A. Finality of Previous Office Action

Applicant notes with appreciation the withdrawal of the final status of the previous office action.

B. Rejection of Claims 1 and 2 as Anticipated by Beardsley

In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Beardsley et. al, U.S. Statutory Invention Registration No. H1,869.¹ Beardsley is directed towards the application of an anti-corrosion coating to the seat face of a valve to minimize corrosion of the valve at the seat. In particular, Beardsley discloses a coating that may be applied to either the contact face 16 formed at the junction of a port with the combustion chamber (typically referred to as a valve seat) or the valve seat face 22

¹ The Notice of References Cited mis-identifies the relevant reference as being US 1,869, dated November, 1840. US 1,869 is a patent to Rice, relating to a pipe coupling. Applicant has prepared the present response based on the identification contained within the written Office Action, and would appreciate that cited art on the face of any resulting patent correctly identify the reference at issue.

(which is the port side of the valve.) Neither the contact face nor the valve seat face form a surface of the combustion volume, as during combustion the valve is closed, and the valve seat face and contact face are engaged against each other, to seal the combustion volume. Accordingly, Beardsley does not disclose any surface of the combustion volume being coated, let alone the portions recited in claims 1 and 2 of the present application. Accordingly, Beardsley cannot anticipate either claim, and accordingly, the present rejection is erroneous.

Furthermore, Beardsley is inapt in any obviousness analysis, for the same reason: it does not teach coating any of the surfaces which form the combustion volume.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that Beardsley neither anticipates claims 1 or 2, nor renders them obvious, and accordingly, claims 1 and 2 as previously presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request the issuance of a Notice Of Allowance for claims 1 and 2 at the earliest possible time. Applicants further respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone call should there be any outstanding issues related to the issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl H. Pierce
Reg. No. 45,730
Reed Smith LLP
2500 One Liberty Place
1650 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7301
(215) 241-7970

Dated: November 15, 2007